arXiv:1601.05602v3 [math.GT] 23 Mar 2016

ALGEBRAIC TORSION FOR CONTACT MANIFOLDS WITH CONVEX BOUNDARY

ANDRÁS JUHÁSZ AND SUNGKYUNG KANG

Abstract. We extend the Heegaard Floer homological definition of algebraic torsion (AT) for closed contact 3-manifolds due to Kutluhan et al. to contact 3-manifolds with convex boundary. We show that the AT of a codimension zero contact submanifold bounds the AT of the ambient manifold from above. As the neighborhood of an overtwisted disk has algebraic torsion zero, we obtain that overtwisted contact structures have vanishing AT. We also prove that the AT of a small perturbation of a 2π Giroux torsion domain has AT at most two, hence any contact structure with positive Giroux torsion has AT at most two (and, in particular, a vanishing contact invariant).

1. Introduction

Algebraic torsion of closed contact $(2n-1)$-manifolds was defined by Latschev and Wendl [LWH] via symplectic field theory. It is an invariant with values in $\mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$ whose finiteness gives obstructions to the existence of symplectic fillings and exact symplectic cobordisms. They also showed that the order of algebraic torsion is zero if and only if the contact homology is trivial – in particular, if the contact structure is overtwisted – and it has order at most one in the presence of positive Giroux torsion. Note that the analytical foundations of symplectic field theory are still under development. Hence, in the appendix, Hutchings provided a similar numerical invariant for contact 3-manifolds via embedded contact homology, however, it is currently unknown whether this is independent of the contact form.

Motivated by the isomorphism between embedded contact homology and Heegaard Floer homology, Kutluhan et al. [KMVW1, KMVW2] defined a Heegaard Floer homological analogue of algebraic torsion for closed contact 3-manifolds. Their definition uses open book decompositions, and gives a refinement of the Ozsváth-Szabó contact invariant $c(\xi)$. Using the fact that an overtwisted contact structure is supported by an open book with non right-veering monodromy, they proved that $AT(M,\xi)=0$ if ξ is overtwisted.

In this paper, we extend AT to contact manifolds with convex boundary, following the definition of Kutluhan et al. in the closed case. The definition is in terms of a partial open book decomposition of the underlying sutured manifold supporting the contact structure, and a collection of arcs of the page, containing a basis. This data gives rise to a filtration of the sutured Floer boundary map, and the algebraic torsion is the index of the first page of the associated spectral sequence where the distinguished generator representing the contact invariant vanishes, or ∞ otherwise. Then we take the minimum over all collections of arcs containing a basis and partial open books. (This extension of the definition of AT was also independently observed by Kutluhan et al. [KMVW2].)

Our first main result is that the algebraic torsion of a codimension zero contact submanifold gives an upper bound on the algebraic torsion of the ambient manifold.

Date: March 25, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57M27; 57R58.

Key words and phrases. Contact structure; Algebraic torsion; Heegaard Floer homology.

AJ was supported by a Royal Society Research Fellowship.

Theorem 1. *Let (M,ξ) be a contact 3-manifold with convex boundary, and $(N,\xi|_N)$ is a codimension zero submanifold of Int(M) with convex boundary. Then*

$$AT(N,\xi|_N) \geq AT(M,\xi).$$

We will prove this result in Section 3. As a corollary, we show that if a contact manifold with convex boundary is overtwisted, then it has algebraic torsion zero. This follows immediately from a simple computation that a neighborhood of an overtwisted disk has algebraic torsion zero.

In Section 4, we carry out a computation that shows that the algebraic torsion of a slight enlargement of a Giroux 2π-torsion $T^2 \times I$ has algebraic torsion at most two. In particular, every contact manifold with positive Giroux torsion has vanishing Ozsváth-Szabó invariant, which was proved in the closed case by Ghiggini et al. [GHV], modulo the issue of defining canonical orientation systems in sutured Floer homology. Together with Theorem 1, we obtain the following corollary.

Theorem 2. *If a contact 3-manifold (M,ξ) with convex boundary has Giroux 2π-torsion, then*

$$AT(M,\xi) \leq 2.$$

The inequality $AT \leq 1$ was shown in the closed case by Latschev and Wendl [LWH, Theorem 2] via symplectic field theory, and conjectured in the Heegaard Floer setting in the closed case by Kutluhan et al. [KMVW2, Question 6.3]. More generally, they asked whether the presence of planar k-torsion (see [LWH, Section 3.1] for a definition) implies that the order of the algebraic torsion is at most k.

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank Cagatay Kutluhan, Gordana Matić, Jeremy Van Horn-Morris, and Andy Wand for pointing out a mistake in the first version of this paper, and for helpful discussions, and Paolo Ghiggini and Chris Wendl for their comments.

2. Algebraic torsion for manifolds with boundary

We first recall the Heegaard Floer homological definition of algebraic torsion for closed contact 3-manifolds due to Kutluhan et al. [KMVW2]. Let (M,ξ) be a closed contact 3-manifold. By the Giroux correspondence theorem [Gi], the contact structure ξ is supported by some open book decomposition of M, which is well-defined up to positive stabilizations. Choosing any compatible open book (S,ϕ) and a pairwise disjoint collection of arcs $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ on S that contains a basis induces a multi-pointed Heegaard diagram $(\Sigma,\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\mathbf{z})$ of M. Here, an arc basis is a set of pairwise disjoint properly embedded arcs on S that forms a basis of $H_1(S,\partial S)$, and $\mathbf{z}$ consists of one basepoint in each connected component of $S \setminus \underline{\mathbf{a}}$. We obtain $\underline{\mathbf{b}}$ by isotoping $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ such that the endpoints of $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ are moved in the positive direction along ∂S, and each component of $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ intersects the corresponding component of $\underline{\mathbf{b}}$ positively in a single point. Then we set $\Sigma = (S \times \{1/2\}) \cup_{\partial S} (-S \times \{0\})$, and let

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \{\, (a \times \{1/2\}) \cup (a \times \{0\}) : \, a \in \underline{\mathbf{a}} \,\}, \text{ and}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \{\, (b \times \{1/2\}) \cup (\phi(b) \times \{0\}) : \, b \in \underline{\mathbf{b}} \,\}.$$

We say that a domain D in the diagram $(\Sigma,\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\mathbf{z})$ connects $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$ if $\partial(\partial D \cap \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}$ and $\partial(\partial D \cap \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$, and we denote by $D(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ the set of such domains. Using this Heegaard diagram, Kutluhan at al. [KMVW2] defined a function J_+ that assigns an integer to every domain $D \in D(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, as follows:

$$J_+(D) = n_{\mathbf{x}}(D) + n_{\mathbf{y}}(D) - e(D) + |\mathbf{x}| - |\mathbf{y}|.$$

Here, $n_{\mathbf{x}}(D)$ is the sum over all $p \in \mathbf{x}$ of the averages of the coefficients of D at the four regions around p, the term $e(D)$ is the Euler measure of D, and $|\mathbf{x}|$, $|\mathbf{y}|$ are the number of cycles in the elements of the permutation group S_n associated with $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, respectively. When D is a domain

of Maslov index 1, the equality $e(D) = 1 - n_{\mathbf{x}}(D) - n_{\mathbf{y}}(D)$ holds by the work of Lipshitz [Li], so the formula becomes

$$J_+(D) = 2(n_{\mathbf{x}}(D) + n_{\mathbf{y}}(D)) - 1 + |\mathbf{x}| - |\mathbf{y}|.$$

For any topological Whitney disk $C \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, we can define $J_+(C)$ as the value $J_+(D(C))$, where $D(C)$ is the domain of C. The function J_+ is additive in the sense that

$$J_+(D_1 + D_2) = J_+(D_1) + J_+(D_2)$$

for every $D_1 \in D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $D_2 \in D(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$. Furthermore, $J_+(C)$ is always a nonnegative even integer for any J-holomorphic disk C. Hence, we have a splitting

$$\widehat{\partial}_{HF} = \partial_0 + \partial_1 + \partial_2 + \cdots$$

of the Heegaard Floer differential $\widehat{\partial}_{HF}$, where ∂_i is defined by counting all J-holomorphic disks C satisfying $\mu(C) = 1$ and $J_+(C) = 2i$. As shown in [KMVW2], this gives a spectral sequence

$$E^n(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}}) = H_* \left(E^{n-1}(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}}), d^{n-1} \right),$$

induced by the filtered complex

$$\left(C = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \widehat{CF}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{z})_i,\ \widehat{\partial} \right),$$

where $\widehat{\partial}$ is the differential defined as

$$\widehat{\partial}(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \partial_i c_{i+j} \right)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$$

for $c_i \in \widehat{CF}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})_i$, and the filtration is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_p C = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p} \widehat{CF}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{z})_i.$$

Note that here we deviate slightly from the definition of Kutluhan et al. [KMVW2] in that we take the direct sum defining C over $\mathbb{N}$ instead of $\mathbb{Z}$, but as we shall see, the arising notion of algebraic torsion is exactly the same.

Recall that a filtered complex

$$\cdots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p-1} C \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p C \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p+1} C \subseteq \dots$$

induces a spectral sequence by setting

$$Z_p^k = \{\, x \in \mathcal{F}_p C \colon \partial x \in \mathcal{F}_{p-k} C \,\} \text{ and}$$
$$B_p^k = \mathcal{F}_p C \cap \partial \mathcal{F}_{p+k} C.$$

For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, the *k-page* is the complex $\left(E^r = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} E_p^k, d^k\right)$, where

$$E_p^k = \frac{Z_p^k}{Z_{p-1}^{k-1} + B_p^{k-1}},$$

and the differential $d^k \colon E_p^k \to E_{p-k}^k$ is induced by the differential ∂ on the complex C.

For an open book decomposition (S, ϕ) supporting ξ, and a collection of arcs $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ on S containing a basis, we denote the induced spectral sequence defined above by $E^n(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$. Then note that, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$,

$$Z_0^k(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}}) = \{\, (c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} :\ c_i = 0 \text{ for } i > 0 \text{ and } \partial_0 c_0 = 0 \,\}.$$

Recall that the contact element is defined as

$$EH(\xi) = (\underline{\mathbf{b}} \cap \underline{\mathbf{a}}) \times \{1/2\} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta.$$

As there are no non-trivial pseudo-holomorphic disks emanating from $EH(\xi)$ in $(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ that contribute to $\widehat{\partial}_{HF}$, it follows that $\partial_k EH(\xi) = 0$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We often view $EH(\xi)$ as an element of C supported in degree zero; i.e., as a sequence $(d_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $d_0 = EH(\xi)$ and $d_i = 0$ for $i > 0$. As such, $EH(\xi) \in Z_0^k(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 1. Let (M, ξ) be a closed contact 3-manifold. We say that $AT(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}}) = k$ if the contact element

$$EH(\xi) \in \widehat{CF}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{z})_0,$$

viewed in degree 0, is nonzero in $E^k(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$, and zero in $E^{k+1}(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$. Then we define the *algebraic torsion of* (M, ξ) as

$$AT(M, \xi) = \min \{\, AT(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}}) :\ (S, \phi) \text{ supports } \xi \text{ and } \underline{\mathbf{a}} \subset S \text{ contains an arc basis} \,\}.$$

Implicit in the above definition is the choice of an almost complex structure J on $\mathrm{Sym}^g(\Sigma)$. It was shown by Kutluhan et al. [KMVW2, Proposition 3.1] that $AT(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}}, J)$ is independent of J, hence we suppress it from our notation throughout.

Remark. The contact element $EH(\xi)$, viewed in degree zero, vanishes in $E^{k+1}(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$ if and only if it is contained in

$$B_0^k(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathcal{F}_0 C \cap \widehat{\partial} \mathcal{F}_k C = \widehat{CF}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})_0 \cap \widehat{\partial} \left(\bigoplus_{i=0}^{k} \widehat{CF}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})_i \right).$$

This holds precisely if there exist elements $c_i \in \widehat{CF}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{z})$ for $i \in \{\, 0, \dots, k \,\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{k} \partial_i c_i &= EH(\xi), \text{ and} \\ \sum_{i=0}^{k-j} \partial_i c_{i+j} &= 0 \text{ for all } j > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Indeed, if we set $c_i = 0$ for $i > k$, then the entries of $\widehat{\partial}(c_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ correspond to the left-hand side of equation (2.1), and so this equation translates to $\widehat{\partial}(c_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} = (d_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $d_0 = EH(\xi)$ and $d_j = 0$ for $j > 0$. As equation (2.1) coincides with the one defining $\mathcal{B}^k(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$ in [KMVW2, p5], it follows that it does not matter whether we take the direct sum over $\mathbb{N}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$ when we define AT.

Before extending this definition to manifolds with boundary, we first review the definition of partial open book decompositions, introduced by Honda, Kazez, and Matić [HKM1]. We follow the treatment of Etgu and Ozbagci [EO]. An abstract partial open book decomposition is a triple $\mathcal{P} = (S, P, h)$, where

- S is a compact oriented connected surface with nonempty boundary,
- $P = P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_r$ is a proper subsurface of S such that S is obtained from $\overline{S \setminus P}$ by successively attaching 1-handles $P_1, \dots, P_r$,
- $h : P \to S$ is an embedding such that $h|_A = \mathrm{Id}_A$, where $A = \partial P \cap \partial S$.

Given a partial open book decomposition (S, P, h), we associate to it a sutured 3-manifold (M, Γ), as follows. Let $H = S \times [-1, 0]/\sim$, where $(x, t) \sim (x, t')$ for every $x \in \partial S$ and $t,\ t' \in [-1, 0]$. Furthermore, let $N = P \times I/\sim$, where $(x, t) \sim (x, t')$ for every $x \in A$ and $t,\ t' \in I$. We obtain the

manifold M by gluing $(x,0) \in \partial N$ to $(x,0) \in \partial H$ and $(x,1) \in \partial N$ to $(h(x),-1) \in \partial H$ for every $x \in P$. The sutures are defined as

$$\Gamma = (\overline{\partial S \setminus \partial P}) \times \{0\} \cup -(\overline{\partial P \setminus \partial S}) \times \{1/2\}.$$

Then

$$\Sigma = (P \times \{0\} \cup -S \times \{-1\})/\sim$$

is a Heegaard surface for (M,Γ).

Let ξ be a contact structure on M such that ∂M is convex with dividing set Γ. Similarly to the original Giroux correspondence, we say that ξ is compatible with the partial open book decomposition (S,P,h) if

- ξ is tight on the handlebodies H and N,
- ∂H is a convex surface with dividing set $\partial S \times \{0\}$,
- ∂N is a convex surface with dividing set $\partial P \times \{1/2\}$.

Then the relative Giroux correspondence theorem says that ξ is uniquely determined up to contact isotopy, and given such a contact structure ξ, any two partial open book decompositions compatible with ξ are related by positive stabilizations.

We now extend the definition of algebraic torsion to manifolds with boundary. Suppose that a contact 3-manifold (M,ξ) with convex boundary ∂M and dividing set Γ is given. Then (M,Γ) is a balanced sutured manifold if M has no closed components. Indeed, every convex surface has a non-empty dividing set, and $\chi(R_+(\Gamma)) = \chi(R_-(\Gamma))$ by [Ju2, Proposition 3.5]. Then we have a compatible partial open book decomposition $\mathcal{P} = (S,P,h)$. An arc basis for (S,P,h) is a set $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ of properly embedded arcs in P with endpoints on A such that $S \setminus \underline{\mathbf{a}}$ deformation retracts onto $\overline{S \setminus P}$. Similarly to the closed case, a partial open book decomposition of M, together with a parwise disjoint collection of arcs $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ containing a basis and an appropriate choice of basepoints, gives a multipointed sutured Heegaard diagram $(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{z})$ of (M,Γ). Here, $\mathbf{z}$ consists of a basepoint in each component of $P \setminus \underline{\mathbf{a}}$ disjoint from $\partial P \setminus \partial S$.

The differential $\widehat{\partial}_{SFH}$ of the sutured Floer chain complex counts the number of J-holomorphic curves C with $\mu(C) = 1$, modulo the $\mathbb{R}$-action, that do not intersect the suture $\Gamma = \partial\Sigma$. For any topological Whitney disk C from $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$ to $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$ that does not intersect $\partial\Sigma$, we define the number $J_+(C)$ as in the closed case by

$$J_+(C) = n_{\mathbf{x}}(D) + n_{\mathbf{y}}(D) - e(D) + |\mathbf{x}| - |\mathbf{y}|,$$

where $D = D(C)$ is the domain of C. Since the equality $e(D) = 1 - n_{\mathbf{x}}(D) - n_{\mathbf{y}}(D)$ for $\mu(D) = 1$ still holds in the sutured case, we get that

$$J_+(C) = 2(n_{\mathbf{x}}(D) + n_{\mathbf{y}}(D)) - 1 + |\mathbf{x}| - |\mathbf{y}| \tag{2.2}$$

when $\mu(C) = 1$. As in the closed case, the function J_+ is clearly additive, and the same argument as in [KMVW2, Section 2.2] shows that it is a non-negative even integer.

Hence, we can split the sutured Floer differential $\widehat{\partial}_{SFH}$ as

$$\widehat{\partial}_{SFH} = \partial_0 + \partial_1 + \cdots,$$

where ∂_r counts J-holomorphic curves C with $\mu(C) = 1$ and $J_+(C) = 2r$.

Just like in the closed case, the pair $\left(\bigoplus_{r\in\mathbb{N}} CF(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{z})_r, \widehat{\partial}\right)$, where the map $\widehat{\partial}$ is defined as

$$\widehat{\partial}(c_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \partial_i c_{i+j}\right)_{j\in\mathbb{N}},$$

is a filtered chain complex. Using its induced spectral sequence, we can define the algebraic torsion of (M,ξ) in the following way.

Definition 2. For a contact 3-manifold (M,ξ) with convex boundary, a compatible partial open book decomposition $\mathcal{P}$, and a pairwise disjoint collection of arcs $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ containing an arc basis, denote the induced spectral sequence by $E^n(\mathcal{P},\underline{\mathbf{a}})$. We say that $AT(\mathcal{P},\underline{\mathbf{a}})=k$ if the contact class $EH(\xi)\in CF(\Sigma,\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{z})_0$ in degree 0 remains nonzero in $E^k(\mathcal{P},\underline{\mathbf{a}})$, but vanishes in $E^{k+1}(\mathcal{P},\underline{\mathbf{a}})$. Then we define

$$AT(M,\xi)=\min\left\{AT(\mathcal{P},\underline{\mathbf{a}}):\ \mathcal{P}\text{ is compatible and }\underline{\mathbf{a}}\text{ contains a basis}\right\}.$$

This is always a nonnegative integer.

Remark. Given a closed contact 3-manifold (M,ξ), the contact manifold $(M(1),\xi)$ is obtained by removing a tight contact ball from M. The suture on $\partial M(1)\simeq S^2$ is a single curve. Then it follows from the above definition that $\mathrm{AT}(M(1),\xi)=\mathrm{AT}(M,\xi)$.

3. Inequality of algebraic torsions

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1 from the introduction. Let (M,ξ) be a contact 3-manifold with convex boundary and dividing set Γ_M, and let N be a codimension zero submanifold of $\mathrm{Int}(M)$, also with convex boundary and dividing set Γ_N. We can suppose that $M\setminus N$ has no isolated components; i.e., every component of $M\setminus N$ intersects ∂M. Indeed, removing a tight contact ball from each isolated components leaves AT unchanged.

We now briefly recall the construction of the contact gluing map Φ on sutured Floer homology, defined by Honda, Kazez, and Matić [HKM1]. Choose a tubular neighborhood $U\simeq\partial N\times\mathbb{R}$ of ∂N, on which the contact structure ξ becomes $\mathbb{R}$-invariant, and write $N'=M\setminus(N\cup U)$. Let $\Sigma_{N'}$ be a Heegaard surface compatible with $\xi|_{N'}$, and let Σ_U be a Heegaard surface compatible with $\xi|_U$. Then, for any sutured Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}=(\Sigma,\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ of (N,Γ_N) that is contact-compatible near ∂N in the sense of Honda et al. [HKM1], $\Sigma\cup\Sigma_U\cup\Sigma_{N'}$ is a Heegaard surface for (M,Γ_M), and we can complete $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ to attaching sets of (M,Γ_M) by adding $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}'$ compatible with $\xi|_{N'\cup U}$. We write

$$\mathcal{H}'=(\Sigma\cup\Sigma_U\cup\Sigma_{N'},\boldsymbol{\beta}\cup\boldsymbol{\beta}',\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cup\boldsymbol{\alpha}').$$

Then the map

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi:CF(\mathcal{H}) &\to CF(\mathcal{H}'),\\ \mathbf{y} &\mapsto (\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}')\end{aligned}$$

is a chain map, where $\mathbf{x}'\in\mathbb{T}_{\beta'}\cap\mathbb{T}_{\alpha'}$ is the canonical representative of the contact class $EH(\xi|_{N'\cup U})$. Note that this construction makes sense even if we replace Heegaard diagrams by multipointed Heegaard diagrams

Suppose that we choose the diagram $(\Sigma,\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ to be the one induced from a partial open book decomposition $\mathcal{P}_N=(S_N,P_N,h_N)$ of $(N,\xi|_N,\Gamma_N)$, together with a choice of an arc basis $\underline{\mathbf{a}}_N$. Then, since $\xi|_N$ and $\xi|_U$ come from the same contact structure ξ, it is automatically contact-compatible near $\partial N'$, which in turn implies that the map Φ above is well-defined when we use this diagram. Also, it obviously maps the contact class of N to the contact class of M. Note that this construction of Honda et al. [HKM1] actually gives a partial open book $\mathcal{P}=(S,P,h)$ and an arc basis $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ that extends $\mathcal{P}_N$ and $\underline{\mathbf{a}}_N$, respectively.

Now consider the case when $\underline{\mathbf{a}}_N$ is not an arc basis, but a pairwise disjoint collection of arcs that contains an arc basis. Then we need to choose basepoints $\mathbf{z}$ such that every connected component of $P_N\setminus\cup\underline{\mathbf{a}}_N$ that does not intersect $\partial P_N\setminus\partial S_N$ has exactly one basepoint. The gluing process can be applied to this case without modifications, to get a pairwise disjoint collection of arcs $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ in P.

After gluing, every connected component of $P \setminus \cup\underline{\mathbf{a}}$ disjoint from $\partial P \setminus \partial S$ contains exactly one basepoint, since such a component must come from $P_N \setminus \cup\underline{\mathbf{a}}_N$, and other components do not contain a basepoint. Hence, the data $(\mathcal{P}, \underline{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{z})$ satisfies the conditions needed to define its AT. The proof of the fact that the gluing map is a chain map between Floer chain complexes [HKM1] also applies to this case without further modifications, by the same reason.

Lemma 3. *Let Φ be as above. Then the map*

$$\overline{\Phi}\colon \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} CF(\mathcal{H})_i \to \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} CF(\mathcal{H}')_i$$

defined by $\overline{\Phi}\left((c_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\right) = (\Phi(c_i))_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a filtered chain map, hence induces a morphism $(\Phi^r)_{r\in\mathbb{N}}$ of spectral sequences; i.e., $\Phi^0 = \overline{\Phi}$, and

$$\Phi^r\colon E^r(\mathcal{P}_N, \underline{\mathbf{a}}_N) \to E^r(\mathcal{P}, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$$

is a chain map for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the map induced on homology is Φ^{r+1}.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{T}_\beta \cap \mathbb{T}_\alpha$. Any holomorphic disk C from $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}')$ to $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}')$ in $CF(\mathcal{H}')$ is actually a holomorphic disk from $\mathbf{y}$ to $\mathbf{z}$ in $CF(\mathcal{H})$; i.e., its domain $D := \mathcal{D}(C)$ is zero outside Σ, see [HKM1]. Since the Euler measure and the point measure of D depend only on the non-zero coefficients, the Maslov index of C in $\mathcal{H}$ and in $\mathcal{H}'$ are the same. Suppose that $\mu(C) = 1$. Then, in $\mathcal{H}'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_+(C) &= 2(n_{(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}')}(D) + n_{(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}')}(D)) - 1 + |(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}')| - |(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}')| \\ &= 2(n_{\mathbf{y}}(D) + n_{\mathbf{z}}(D)) - 1 + |\mathbf{y}| + |\mathbf{x}'| - |\mathbf{z}| - |\mathbf{x}'| \\ &= 2(n_{\mathbf{y}}(D) + n_{\mathbf{z}}(D)) - 1 + |\mathbf{y}| - |\mathbf{z}|. \end{aligned}$$

This is the same as the value of $J_+(C)$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Hence Φ preserves the J_+ filtration.

Now, by the definition of the differential ∂_r, the map Φ commutes with ∂_r for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, it commutes with the total differential $\widehat{\partial}$, and so $\overline{\Phi}$ is a filtered chain map. Therefore $\overline{\Phi}$ induces a morphism $(\Phi^r)_{r\in\mathbb{N}}$ between the corresponding spectral sequences. □

Proof of Theorem 1. Since $\Phi(EH(\xi|_N)) = EH(\xi)$, Lemma 3 implies that

$$AT(\mathcal{P}_N, \underline{\mathbf{a}}_N) \geq AT(\mathcal{P}, \underline{\mathbf{a}}) \geq AT(M, \xi).$$

Taking the minimum of over all possible choices of $(\mathcal{P}_N, \underline{\mathbf{a}}_N)$, we get that

$$AT(N, \xi|_N) \geq AT(M, \xi),$$

as required. □

4. Calculation of upper bounds to some algebraic torsions

Let (M, ξ) be a contact 3-manifold with convex boundary. Suppose that (M, ξ) is overtwisted. Then, by definition, it contains an embedded overtwisted disk Δ. This has a standard neighborhood; i.e., there exists a neighborhood $U \supset \Delta$ such that $(U, \xi|_U)$ is contactomorphic to a neighborhood of the disk $\Delta_{std} = \{z = 0, \rho \leq \pi\}$ inside the standard overtwisted contact structure on $\mathbb{R}^3$, which is defined as follows [El]:

$$\xi_{OT} = \ker(\cos\rho\, dz + \rho \sin\rho\, d\phi).$$

Inside U, we can perturb Δ to a convex surface D. Take a neighborhood $V = D \times [-1, 1]$ such that $\xi|_{\mathrm{Int}(M)}$ is $\mathbb{R}$-invariant. After rounding its edges, we obtain an open subset $V_0 \simeq D^3$ such that the dividing set Γ_{V_0} on ∂V_0 is given by three disjoint curves. Honda, Kazez, and Matić [HKM2, Example 1] gave a partial open book decomposition of $N = \overline{V_0}$, and the corresponding Heegaard diagram is shown in Figure 4.1. This diagram can be used to show that $AT(M, \xi) = 0$, which was



FIGURE 4.1. A sutured Heegaard diagram arising from a partial open book decomposition of a neighborhood of an overtwisted disk. We obtain the Heegaard surface by identifying the two bold horizontal arcs.

proven by Kutluhan et al. [KMVW1] in the closed case using the fact that an overtwisted contact structure admits an open book whose monodromy is not right-veering.

Proposition 4. *If N is the standard neighborhood of an overtiwsted disk in the contact manifold (M,ξ) as above, then*

$$AT(N,\xi|_N) = 0.$$

Proof. Honda et al. [HKM2, Example 1] computed that $c(N,\xi|_N) = 0$; we extend their proof. Consider the partial open book decomposition of (N,ξ) shown in Figure 4.1. The contact element $EH(N,\xi|_N)$ is represented by the point x, which is zero in homology because $\partial y = x$. The only J-holomophic curve from y to x is the bigon, which satisfies $J_+ = 0$. Hence $AT(N,\xi|_N) \leq 0$. □

Theorem 5. *If the contact manifold (M,ξ) with convex boundary is overtwisted, then $AT(M,\xi) = 0$.*

Proof. We have $AT(M,\xi) \leq AT(N,\xi|_N) = 0$ by Theorem 1 and Proposition 4. □

We now consider the case when (M,ξ) has Giroux 2π-torsion. Recall that a contact manifold (M,ξ) has 2π-torsion if it admits an embedding

$$(M_{2\pi},\eta_{2\pi}) = (T^2\times[0,1], \ker(\cos(2\pi t)\,dx - \sin(2\pi t)\,dy)) \hookrightarrow (M,\xi).$$

The boundary of $(M_{2\pi},\eta_{2\pi})$ is not convex. However, as in [GHV, Lemma 5], if it embeds in (M,ξ), then there exist small ϵ_0, $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that the slightly extended domain

$$(M',\eta') = \big(T^2\times[-\epsilon_0, 1+\epsilon_1], \ker(\cos(2\pi t)\,dx - \sin(2\pi t)\,dy)\big)$$

also embeds inside (M,ξ) such that $T^2\times\{-\epsilon_0\}$ and $T^2\times\{\epsilon_1\}$ are pre-Lagrangian tori with integer slopes s_0 and s_1 that form a basis of $H_1(T^2)$. By the work of Ghiggini [Gh], we can perturb $\partial M'$ to get a new contact submanifold $\widetilde{M}$ such that $\partial\widetilde{M}$ is convex, and the slopes of the dividing sets are s_0 and s_1. After a change of coordinates in $\widetilde{M}$, we can assume these slopes are 0 and ∞.

The contact manifold $\widetilde{M}$ is non-minimally-twisting and consists of five basic slices, which means that we can construct a partial open book decomposition of it by attaching four bypasses to a partial open book diagram of a basic slice, which can be found in Examples 4, 5, and 6 of [HKM2]. The diagram we get is shown in Figure 4.2.



FIGURE 4.2. A sutured diagram arising from a partial open book decomposition of a neighborhood of a Giroux torsion domain. The opposite green arcs in the boundary are identified.



FIGURE 4.3. We apply the Sarkar-Wang algorithm by isotoping the red curves along the dashed arcs.



FIGURE 4.4. The diagram after applying the Sarkar-Wang algorithm.

Applying the Sarkar-Wang algorithm [SW] to this diagram along the dotted arcs in Figure 4.3 gives the one in Figure 4.4. It is easy to check that every region that does not intersect the boundary is either a bigon or a quadrilateral.



FIGURE 4.5. The quadrilaterals and bigons relevant to the computation are shaded.

The contact element $EH\left(\xi|_{\widetilde{M}}\right)$ is represented by the unordered tuple $(x_1, y_1, z_1, w_1, v_1)$. We now directly prove that the contact invariant of $\widetilde{M}$ is zero and calculate its algebraic torsion with respect to the given diagram, thus giving an upper bound on $AT(\widetilde{M})$.

If Q is a quadrilateral component of $\Sigma\setminus(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cup\boldsymbol{\beta})$ disjoint from $\partial\Sigma$ with corners c_1, c_2, c_3, $c_4 \in \boldsymbol{\alpha}\cap\boldsymbol{\beta}$, then we say that c_1, c_3 are its from-corners and c_2, c_4 are its to-corners if

$$\partial(\partial Q \cap \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = c_1 + c_3 - c_2 - c_4.$$

For any generator $(c_1, c_3, \dots) \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$, the coefficient of $(c_2, c_4, \dots)$ in the boundary $\partial(c_1, c_3, \dots)$ is the number of such quadrilaterals.

Since the only quadrilateral whose to-corners are in $\{x_1, y_1, z_1, w_1, v_1\}$ is $y_1y_2z_1z_2$, we get that

$$\partial(x_1, y_2, z_2, w_1, v_1) = (x_1, y_1, z_1, w_1, v_1) + (x_1, y_3, z_2, w_1, v_1),$$

where the last term comes from the bigon y_2y_3. This quadrilateral and bigon are shaded grey in Figure 4.4.

The only quadrilateral whose to-corners are in $\{x_1, y_2, z_2, w_1, v_1\}$ is $x_1x_2y_3y_4$, and we have that

$$\partial(x_2, y_4, z_2, w_1, v_1) = (x_1, y_3, z_2, w_1, v_1) + (x_3, y_4, z_2, w_1, v_1),$$

where the last term comes from the bigon x_2x_3. This quadrilateral and bigon are shaded pink in Figure 4.4.

The only quadrilateral whose to-corners are in $\{x_3, y_4, z_2, w_1, v_1\}$ is $x_3x_4w_1w_2$, and we have that

$$\partial(x_4, y_4, z_2, w_2, v_1) = (x_3, y_4, z_2, w_1, v_1) + (x_5, y_4, z_2, w_2, v_1),$$

where the last term comes from the bigon x_4x_5. This quadrilateral and bigon are shaded light blue in Figure 4.4.

The only quadrilateral whose to-corners are in $\{x_5, y_4, z_2, w_2, v_1\}$ is $x_5x_6z_2z_3$, shaded green in Figure 4.4, and we have that

$$\partial(x_6, y_4, z_3, w_2, v_1) = (x_5, y_4, z_2, w_2, v_1) + (x_9, y_1, z_3, w_2, v_1),$$

where the last term comes from the quadrilateral $x_6x_9y_4y_1$.

The only quadrilateral whose to-corners are in $\{x_9, y_1, z_3, w_2, v_1\}$ is $y_1y_{15}z_3z_2$, and we have that

$$\partial(x_9, y_{15}, z_2, w_2, v_1) = (x_9, y_1, z_3, w_2, v_1) + (x_9, y_{14}, z_2, w_2, v_1),$$

where the last term comes from the bigon $y_{15}y_{14}$. This quadrilateral and bigon are shaded yellow in Figure 4.4.

The only quadrilateral whose to-corners are in $\{x_9, y_{14}, z_2, w_2, v_1\}$ is $y_{14}y_{13}v_1v_2$, and we have that

$$\partial(x_9, y_{13}, z_2, w_2, v_2) = (x_9, y_{14}, z_2, w_2, v_1) + (x_9, y_{12}, z_2, w_2, v_2),$$

where the last term comes from the bigon $y_{13}y_{12}$. This quadrilateral and bigon are shaded blue in Figure 4.4.

Finally, the only quadrilateral whose to-corners are in $\{x_9, y_{12}, z_2, w_2, v_2\}$ is $y_{12}y_{11}w_2w_3$, shown in red, and we have that

$$\partial(x_9, y_{11}, z_2, w_3, v_2) = (x_9, y_{12}, z_2, w_2, v_2).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial((x_1, y_2, z_2, w_1, v_1) - (x_2, y_4, z_2, w_1, v_1) + (x_4, y_4, z_2, w_2, v_1) - (x_6, y_4, z_3, w_2, v_1)\\ +(x_9, y_{15}, z_2, w_2, v_1) - (x_9, y_{13}, z_2, w_2, v_2) + (x_9, y_{11}, z_2, w_3, v_2)) = (x_1, y_1, z_1, w_1),\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly $EH\left(\xi|_{\widetilde{M}}\right)$. Thus $c\left(\xi|_{\widetilde{M}}\right) = 0$, so the algebraic torsion of $\widetilde{M}$ is finite.

Remark. This result, together with the gluing map of [HKM1], gives an explicit computational proof of the fact that the contact invariant of any contact 3-manifold with Giroux 2π-torsion vanishes, which was proven in the closed case by Ghiggini, Honda, and Van Horn-Morris [GHV] modulo canonical orientation systems in SFH.

Remark. In [HKM2, Example 6-(c)], Honda et al. show that if we only attach four bypasses to a basic slice; i.e., if the contact structure is minimally twisting, then the contact invariant is non-zero because it embeds in the unique Stein fillable contact structure on T^3, which already has non-zero contact invariant. This can also be shown explicitly using a computation analogous to, but simpler than the one above. Hence, it is necessary to enlarge the Giroux 2π-torsion domain a bit to obtain vanishing of the contact element.

Proposition 6. *For the perturbed Giroux 2π-torsion domain $\widetilde{M}$, we have*

$$AT\left(\widetilde{M}, \xi|_{\widetilde{M}}\right) \leq 2.$$

Proof. The complete list of the J-holomorphic disks used in the calculations above and the values used to compute their J_+ are given in the table below. If we label the α- and β-curves such that $x_1 \in \alpha_1 \cap \beta_1$, $y_1 \in \alpha_2 \cap \beta_2$, $z_1 \in \alpha_3 \cap \beta_3$, $w_1 \in \alpha_4 \cap \beta_4$, and $v_1 \in \alpha_5 \cap \beta_5$, then

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, x_9, y_4, y_{16} &\in \beta_1, \\ x_6, y_1, z_2 &\in \beta_2, \\ z_1, x_2, x_3, y_2, y_3, y_{11}, w_2 &\in \beta_3, \\ x_4, x_5, y_{14}, y_{15}, z_3, w_1, v_2 &\in \beta_4, \\ y_{12}, y_{13}, w_3, v_1 &\in \beta_5. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $x_i \in \alpha_1$, $y_i \in \alpha_2$, $z_i \in \alpha_3$, $w_i \in \alpha_4$, and $v_i \in \alpha_5$ for any i. Note that if there is a bigon connecting $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$, then $|\mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{y}|$. Using this,

$$\begin{aligned} |(x_1, y_1, z_1, w_1, v_1)| &= |(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)| = 5, \\ |(x_1, y_2, z_2, w_1, v_1)| &= |(1)(23)(4)(5)| = 4 = |(x_1, y_3, z_2, w_1, v_1)|, \\ |(x_2, y_4, z_2, w_1, v_1)| &= |(132)(4)(5)| = 3 = |(x_3, y_4, z_2, w_1, v_1)|, \\ |(x_4, y_4, z_2, w_2, v_1)| &= |(1432)(5)| = 2 = |(x_5, y_4, z_2, w_2, v_1)|, \\ |(x_6, y_4, z_3, w_2, v_1)| &= |(12)(34)(5)| = 3, \\ |(x_9, y_1, z_3, w_2, v_1)| &= |(1)(2)(34)(5)| = 4, \\ |(x_9, y_{15}, z_2, w_2, v_1)| &= |(1)(243)(5)| = 3 = |(x_9, y_{14}, z_2, w_2, v_1)| \\ |(x_9, y_{14}, z_2, w_2, v_2)| &= |(1)(2543)| = 2 = |(x_9, y_{12}, z_2, w_2, v_2)|, \\ |(x_9, y_{11}, z_2, w_3, v_2)| &= |(1)(23)(45)| = 3. \end{aligned}$$

From the table below, we see that every J-holomorphic disk ϕ used to compute the differential satisfies $J_+(\phi) \leq 2$; cf. Equation 2.2.

Type	Name	$2(n_{\mathbf{x}}+n_{\mathbf{y}})$	$\lvert\mathbf{x}\rvert-\lvert\mathbf{y}\rvert$	J_+
quadrilateral	$y_1y_2z_1z_2$	2	-1	0
quadrilateral	$x_1x_2y_3y_4$	2	-1	0
quadrilateral	$x_3x_4w_1w_2$	2	-1	0
quadrilateral	$x_5x_6z_2z_3$	2	1	2
quadrilateral	$x_6x_9y_4y_1$	2	-1	0
quadrilateral	$y_1y_{15}z_3z_2$	2	-1	0
quadrilateral	$y_{14}y_{13}v_1v_2$	2	-1	0
quadrilateral	$y_{12}y_{11}w_2w_3$	2	1	2
bigon	y_2y_3	1	0	0
bigon	x_2x_3	1	0	0
bigon	x_4x_5	1	0	0
bigon	$y_{15}y_{14}$	1	0	0
bigon	$y_{13}y_{12}$	1	0	0

For simplicity, we will write (i,j,k,l,m) for the generator (x_i,y_j,z_k,w_l,v_m). Then let

$$b_0=(1,2,2,1,1)+(2,4,2,1,1)+(4,4,2,2,1)+(6,4,3,2,1)+(9,15,2,2,1)+(9,13,2,2,2),$$
$$b_1=(6,4,3,2,1)+(9,15,2,2,1)+(9,13,2,2,2)+(9,11,2,3,2),\text{ and}$$
$$b_2=(9,11,2,3,2),$$

considered as chains with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ coefficients. Using the table above,

$$\partial_0 b_0=(1,1,1,1,1)+(5,4,2,2,1)+(9,12,2,2,2),$$
$$\partial_0 b_1=(9,12,2,2,2)\text{ and }\partial_1 b_1=(5,4,2,2,1)+(9,12,2,2,2),$$
$$\partial_0 b_2=0,\ \partial_1 b_2=(9,12,2,2,2),\text{ and }\partial_2 b_2=0.$$

Hence $\partial_0 b_0+\partial_1 b_1=(1,1,1,1,1)$, $\partial_0 b_1+\partial_1 b_2=0$, and $\partial_0 b_2=0$. So, if we set $b_i=0$ for every $i>2$, then $\widehat{\partial}(b_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}=(c_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $c_0=(1,1,1,1,1)$ represents the EH class, and $c_i=0$ for every $i>0$. By equation (2.1), the element $EH\left(\xi|_{\widetilde{M}}\right)$ lies in B_0^2, and hence vanishes in E^3; i.e., $AT\left(\widetilde{M},\xi|_{\widetilde{M}}\right)\leq 2$, as claimed. □

As an immediate corollary, we obtain Theorem 2 from the introduction.

Corollary 7. *If a contact 3-manifold (M,ξ) with convex boundary has Giroux 2π-torsion, then*

$$AT(M,\xi)\leq 2.$$

Proof. If the Giroux 2π-torsion domain $M_{2\pi}$ embeds in M, then the perturbed domain $\widetilde{M}$ also embeds in M, by the argument outlined at the beginning of this section. Then Theorem 1 and Proposition 6 imply that

$$AT(M,\xi)\leq AT\left(\widetilde{M},\xi|_{\widetilde{M}}\right)\leq 2.$$

□

5. Open questions

We raise some questions that naturally arise from the discussions above. First, as in the case of closed contact 3-manifolds, we would like to know how the algebraic torsion $AT(\mathcal{P},\underline{\mathbf{a}})$ depends on the choice of partial open book decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ and arc system $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$.

Remark. Given two possible choices of partial open book decompositions $(\mathcal{P}, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$ and $(\mathcal{P}', \underline{\mathbf{a}}')$ for a given contact 3-manifold (M, ξ) with convex boundary, it is natural to ask whether $AT(\mathcal{P}, \underline{\mathbf{a}}) = AT(\mathcal{P}', \underline{\mathbf{a}}')$. In the closed case, according to Kutluhan et al. [KMVW2], the number $AT(S, \phi, \underline{\mathbf{a}})$ does not depend on the isotopy class of the arc basis $\underline{\mathbf{a}}$, but if two arc bases differ by an arc-slide, the corresponding values of AT might not be the same. Since our definition of AT is a direct generalization of the original one, the same holds in our case.

Now, given the inequality $AT(N, \xi|_N) \geq AT(M, \xi)$, whenever $(N, \xi|_N)$ is a compact codimension zero submanifold of (M, ξ) with convex boundary, we are led to the following question.

Question 1. If a contact 3-manifold (N, ξ) with convex boundary satisfies $AT(M, \xi_M) \leq k$ for every closed contact 3-manifold (M, ξ_M) in which (N, ξ) embeds, do we have $AT(N, \xi) \leq k$?

An affirmative answer to Question 1 would imply that the inequality $AT(N, \xi|_N) \leq AT(M, \xi)$ is sharp and cannot be improved without giving extra conditions even when M is assumed to be closed. We can ask the following question regarding the algebraic torsion of planar torsion domains.

Question 2. Is there a way to prove that the AT of a Giroux torsion domain is at most 1, instead of 2?

The upper bound to the algebraic torsion of a Giroux torsion domain is predicted to be 1 by [KMVW2, Question 6.3], since a Giroux torsion domain is a planar torsion domain of order 1. However, our computation only allows us to prove that it is at most 2. If the above question has an affirmative answer, then we must be able to prove it via explicit computation by starting from a complete system of arcs, and then duplicating the arcs, one by one. The problem is that the resulting diagram is too large for practical computation by hand.

Finally, probably the most interesting question in this area is whether the converse of Theorem 5 holds, analogously to [KMVW2, Question 6.1].

Question 3. If $AT(M, \xi) = 0$, then does this imply that ξ is overtwisted?

References

[El] Ya. Eliashberg, *Classification of overtwisted contact structures on 3-manifolds*, Invent. Math. **98** (1989), no. 3, 623–637.

[EO] T. Etgü and B. Ozbagci, *Partial open book decompositions and the contact class in sutured Floer homology*, Turkish J. Math. **33** (2009), 295–312.

[Gh] P. Ghiggini, *Tight contact structures on Seifert manifolds over T^2 with one singular fibre*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **5** (2005), no. 2, 785–833.

[GHV] P. Ghiggini, K. Honda, and J. Van Horn-Morris, *The vanishing of the contact invariant in the presence of torsion*, arXiv:0706.1602 (2007).

[Gi] E. Giroux, *Géométrie de contact: de la dimension trois vers les dimensions supérieures,* Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002), Higher Ed. Press, 2002, pp. 405–414.

[HKM1] K. Honda, W. H. Kazez, and G. Matić, *Contact structures, sutured Floer homology and TQFT*, arXiv:0807.2431 (2008).

[HKM2] K. Honda, W. H. Kazez, and G. Matić, *The contact invariant in sutured Floer homology*, Invent. Math. **176** (2009), no. 3, 637–676.

[Ju1] A. Juhász, *Holomorphic discs and sutured manifolds*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **6** (2006), no. 3, 1429–1457.

[Ju2] A. Juhász, *The sutured Floer polytope*, Geom. Topol. **14** (2010), 1303–1354.

[KMVW1] C. Kutluhan, G. Matić, J. Van Horn-Morris, and A. Wand, *Algebraic torsion via Heegaard Floer homology*, arXiv:1503.01685 (2015).

[KMVW2] C. Kutluhan, G. Matić, J. Van Horn-Morris, and A. Wand, *Filtering the Heegaard Floer contact invariant*, arXiv:1603.02673 (2016).

[LWH] J. Latschev, C. Wendl, and M. Hutchings, *Algebraic torsion in contact manifolds*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 5, 1144–1195.

[Li] R. Lipshitz, *A cylindrical reformulation of Heegaard Floer homology*, Geom. Topol. **10** (2006), no. 2, 955–1096.

[SW] S. Sarkar and J. Wang, *An algorithm for computing some Heegaard Floer homologies.*, Ann. of Math. **171** (2010), 1213–1236.

[We] C. Wendl, *A hierarchy of local symplectic filling obstructions for contact 3-manifolds*, Duke Math J. **162** (2013), no. 12, 2197–2283.

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Andrew Wiles Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK

E-mail address: juhasza@maths.ox.ac.uk

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Andrew Wiles Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK

E-mail address: sungkyung.kang@maths.ox.ac.uk